

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-19 and 22-27 were pending prior to this amendment. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-19 and 22-27 stand rejected. Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14-17, 19, 22-25 and 27 have been amended. At least in light of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

### *July 3, 2007 telephone interview*

A telephone interview was conducted between Attorney Michael Cofield and Examiners Rhonda Murphy and Huy Vu. During the telephone interview, the Examiners suggested limitations to distinguish the Kannewurff reference cited in the Office Action. Applicant thanks the Examiners for the suggestions and notes that the claims have been amended to include the distinguishing features.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 1-6, 15-19 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over von Kannewurff et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200009 (hereinafter von Kannewurff).

Claim 1 has been amended to include a router with a LAN interface and a separate home automation interface. *See* the present specification, FIG. 2. Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the router is configured to log into an instant messenger application independently of the general purpose computers and regardless of whether all general purpose computers located in the private home network are deactivated. *See* the present specification, page 4, lines 24-28.

Kannewurff discloses a gateway 420 connected to computers and appliances over a same network interface. The gateway 420 is not connected to the computers over a separate home automation interface.

Moreover, the gateway 420 does not log into an instant messenger application to notify a remote user. Even if the gateway 420 did log into the instant messenger application (which it does not), the gateway 420 does not log into an instant messenger application independently of the general purpose computers and regardless of whether all general purpose computers located in the private home network are deactivated.

In contrast, claim 1 includes the features of a router having separate LAN and home automation interfaces and a router independently logging into an instant messenger application. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-6 are dependent and should also be allowed.

Claim 15 has been amended to include features similar to claim 1 and thus should be allowed for at least similar reasons. Claims 16-19 are dependent and should also be allowed. Claim 22 has been amended to include features similar to claim 1 and thus should be allowed for at least similar reasons. Claims 23-27 are dependent and should also be allowed.

Claims 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over von Kanneurff, in view of Albanese et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0167985 (hereinafter Albanese).

Claim 8 has been amended similarly as claim 1 and, because Albanese does not disclose the features absent from Kanneurff, thus should also be allowed. Claims 9-11 and 14 are dependent and should also be allowed.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 503-701-0862 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/Michael A. Cofield/

---

Michael A. Cofield  
Reg. No. 54,630

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP  
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600  
Portland, Oregon 97205

**Customer No. 73552**